

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,054	08/26/2003	Matthew Russell	03-0154	2925
24319 75	590 11/21/2005		EXAMINER	
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106			ANDUJAR, LEONARDO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MILPITAS, C.	A 95035		2826	
			DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7	FL.
•	_

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/648,054		RUSSELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leonardo Andújar	2826	

zororo uno r ming or an rippour ziror	Examiner	Artonit					
	Leonardo Andújar	2826					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 18 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following							
time periods:  a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com-	pliance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be	filed within two month	se of the date of				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS							
3. A The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause				
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be</li> </ul>		ducina or simplifyina	the issues for				
appeal; and/or	tter form for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying	ille issues ioi				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
3. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a							
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	Vo(s).					
3. Other:							
John Man							
		Leonardo-Andijar Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2826	$Q_{i}$				
	,						

Application No. 10/648,054

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's arguments filed 10/18/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claim 1 now recites that said first and second electrically conductive layers and said vias are configured such that said second bus of said first electrically conductive layer is ultimately electrically connected to said first us of said second electrically conductive layer ye said vias do not extend from said second bus of said first electrically conductive layer to said first second electrically conductive layer, these new limitations raise new issues that would require further consideration and or search.